



University of Technology, Sydney

Faculty of Engineering & Information Technology

**The Effect of the Addition of Fulvic Acid and Straw Water on
the Efficiency of Arsenic Uptake from Groundwater by *Vetiveria
zizanioides***

by

Zhuang Zhao

Statement of Originality

The entire work created in this master's thesis report is a sole work of the author. He has not used any fragment of text from other sources without providing the proper acknowledgement. The theories, results and designs of original work have been appropriately referenced and all sources of assistance have been fully acknowledged.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of stylized, flowing characters, positioned above a horizontal line.

Zhuang Zhao

24th December 2012

Abstract

The aim of this research project was to investigate the efficiency of fulvic acid or straw water as an amendment to enhance the uptake of arsenic from groundwater by *Vetiveria*. Fulvic acids and straw water were applied to arsenic-contaminated groundwater at different concentrations (0.1% and 0.01%). It was found that when the higher concentration of straw water was added to the groundwater solution, the efficiency of arsenic accumulation by roots was increased 47.8%. Straw water not only enhances the growth of *Vetiveria*, but also improved arsenic accumulation in both shoots and roots. In contrast, the addition of fulvic acids (at high or low concentrations) resulted in the reduction of *Vetiveria* growth. Specifically, a high concentration of fulvic acid reduced arsenic accumulation in roots whilst a low concentration of fulvic acid decreased arsenic accumulation in shoots.

Acknowledgements

My Masters by research study at the University of Technology, Sydney has been an amazing journey full of challenges, opportunities and excitement. Things were shaky at the beginning and without the supports from many wonderful people it could have been harder or even impossible to complete the journey. It is time for me to express my sincere gratitude to people from whom I have received tremendous support.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Pam Hazelton, and to Dr. Anne Clements for her comments and suggestions.

My thanks to Environmental and Earth Sciences International for the project and to Chris Conoley especially for his help in obtaining the plants and the onsite soil and groundwater for the experiments.

I would like to extend my thanks to Dr. Ronald Shimmon and David Bishop for their assistance in some laboratory analyses and in the operation of the ICP-MS. Thanks are also due to Gemma Armstrong for arrangement of the glasshouse and to Mohammed Johir for his assistance in the environmental lab in FEIT.

Thanks are also due to director Professor Saravanamuth Vigneswaran for his arrangement of a Faculty Scholarship.

I am indebted to my colleague, Yunlong Luo, for his suggestion on writing my thesis.

Finally, my sincere gratitude is given to my parents and those friends who supported me.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
List of figures	vi
List of tables	vii
Abbreviations	viii
Chapter 1. Aims and objectives	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Research aim	4
Chapter 2. Literature Review	5
2.1 Background information.....	5
2.1.1 Soil contamination and soil degradation	5
2.1.2 Sources of soil contamination	6
2.1.3 The different types of soil pollutant	7
2.1.4 Arsenic	8
2.1.5 Vetiver grass.....	9
2.1.6 Fulvic acid.....	9
2.1.7 Straw water.....	10
2.2 Method for soil remediation	11
2.2.1 In-situ soil treatment	11
2.3 Land risk assessment	12
2.4 Biological treatment	13
2.4.1 Phytoremediation	14
2.4.2 Phytoremediation Strategies.....	15

2.4.3	Evaluation of Phytoremediation.....	17
2.4.4	Plant Selection for Phytoremediation	18
2.4.5	Mechanism of phytoremediation.....	19
2.5	Case studies	20
2.6	Efficiency of phytoremediation for contaminated sites.....	27
2.7	Conclusion.....	33
Chapter 3.	Methodology	35
3.1	Introduction	35
3.2	Materials	36
3.2.1	Vetiveria.....	36
3.2.2	Soil collection and characterization	36
3.3	Methods.....	39
3.3.1	First trial (FT).....	39
3.3.2	Second trial (ST)	42
3.3.3	Third trial (TT).....	44
Chapter 4.	Results	51
4.1	Plant growth in the first trial.....	51
4.2	Evaporation rate in the second trial (Split root and shoots)	52
4.3	Results in the third trial	53
4.3.1	pH variation.....	53
4.3.2	Shoots growth in the third trial	54
4.3.3	Arsenic concentration analysis by ICP-MS in the third trial	55
4.3.4	Comparison of the efficiencies of arsenic uptake	58
Chapter 5.	Discussion	59
5.1	Growth in glasshouse under controlled conditions	59
5.2	Effect of fulvic acid and straw water.....	63

Chapter 6. Conclusions	68
6.1 Conclusions	68
6.2 Recommendations for further research	69
Reference.....	70
Appendices.....	78
Appendix 1 Biosafety Approval Form for Arsenic	78
Appendix 2 Glasshouse Condition from May to December	79
Appendix 3 Selected Major Procedure and Instruments of EPA3050 method	80
Appendix 4 <i>Vetiveria</i> Shoots Growth rate in FT (unit: cm).....	81
Appendix 5 <i>Vetiveria</i> Roots Variation before and after FT (cm).....	82
Appendix 6 <i>Vetiveria</i> Shoots Growth Rate in the Third trial (unit: cm).....	83
Appendix 7 Arsenic Concentration Variation in Shoots during Third trial (mg/kg; ppm)	84
Appendix 8 Straw Water Analyses	85

List of figures

Figure 1-1 The site under construction environment, taken by February 2012 (provided by EESI).....	3
Figure 1-2 Contaminated groundwater with arsenic in the site, exposed and polluted to the soil (provided by EESI)	3
Figure 2-1 Relative uptake and bioaccumulation potential among plant species	15
Figure 2-2 Root, shoot and the total dry weights of <i>Vetiveria</i>	31
Figure 2-3 Root, shoot and the total dry weights of maize	31
Figure 2-4 Effects of different chelating agents and their application rates ranging from 0 to 10 g/kg on soil AS, Cu, Pb and Zn extraction. Error bars represent \pm SD (n=4)	32
Figure 2-5 Different Chelating agents impact on As, Cu, Pb and Zn accumulation in the aboveground parts of three plants.....	33
Figure 3-1 Experiment timetable.....	35
Figure 3-2 The pot trial in FT	41
Figure 3-3 Initial planting of the <i>Vetiveria</i> into the pot under glasshouse conditions. This is the beginning of the FT. The height of each plant was measured and recorded including its health condition.	41
Figure 3-4 Measurement of length for roots. This measurement was undertaken twice (beginning and end of the FT)	42
Figure 3-5 The base of a pot after FT, showing the root system.....	42
Figure 3-6 A <i>Vetiveria</i> plant grows at the initial situation in ‘pot & pail’ system	44
Figure 3-7 A <i>Vetiveria</i> plant grows at the end of ST developing roots into pail	44
Figure 3-8 The <i>Vetiveria</i> plant treated in the third trial.....	45
Figure 3-9 The ICP-MS operating to test plant tissue samples	47
Figure 3-10 Equipment used in the soil and plant tissue experiments	48
Figure 3-11 Electronic balance.....	49
Figure 3-12 All the pots within the last treatment, already have introduced groundwater and organic amendments	50
Figure 3-13 The regenerated roots, grow and cross the ‘nylon gauze’ into the water environment.....	50
Figure 4-1 Increase in plant height (mean) over six months period.....	51
Figure 4-2 The <i>Vetiveria</i> mean shoots growth rate in the third trial	54
Figure 4-3 Mean arsenic concentration in the shoots in different treatments)	57
Figure 5-1 The roots developed new roots successfully crossing the ‘nylon gauze’ in the second trial.....	61
Figure 5-2 Root system at the end of third trial.....	62
Figure 5-3 18 <i>Vetiveria</i> in the ‘pot & pail’ system in the third trial.....	63

List of tables

Table 1-1 Conceptual site model and risk screening about arsenic.....	2
Table 2-1 The feasibility of each treatment for different sources pollutants.....	13
Table 2-2 Techniques of in-situ bioremediation	14
Table 2-3 Advantages and limitations of sub-processes under phytoremediation	17
Table 2-4 As concentration in ladder brake and soil as affected by different soil arsenic concentrations	22
Table 2-5 As concentration in ladder brake and soil as affected by different arsenic forms.....	22
Table 2-6 BF and TF values for Ladder brake as impacted by arsenic concentrations after 12 weeks.....	23
Table 2-7 BF and TF values for Ladder brake as impacted by different arsenic forms after 18 weeks treatment.....	23
Table 2-8 Arsenic phytoextraction capacity by ladder brake after 12 weeks treatment of amended different arsenic concentrations.....	24
Table 2-9 Arsenic phytoextraction capacity by ladder brake after 12 weeks treatment of amended different arsenic concentrations.....	24
Table 2-10 Arsenic removal for both <i>Vetiveria</i> (Surat Thani ecotype) and <i>Vetiveria</i> (Prachuabkirikhan ecotype) under 90 days treatment	26
Table 2-11 Soil properties from five different places	26
Table 2-12 Lead concentration in the roots and shoots of <i>Vetiveria</i>	29
Table 2-14 Amendment of 2.5g/kg chelating agents on dry weights of three species (<i>Pteris vittata</i> , <i>Vetiveria zizanioides</i> and <i>Sesbania rostrata</i> (g/pot) grown in metal- contaminated soil(mean \pm SD, n=4) after four weeks treatment.....	29
Table 3-1 The procedures used in glasshouse experiments.....	36
Table 3-2 Data for soil moisture.....	36
Table 3-3 Coding of the solutions in differently marked plastic containers	38
Table 3-4 Soil chemical properties at the research site (Sydney Analytical Laboratories)	38
Table 3-5 pH in each container	39
Table 3-6 The different treatments for each group.....	46
Table 4-1 The time for <i>Vetiveria</i> roots crossing ‘nylon gauze’ and reaching the aquatic environment	52
Table 4-2 The water transpired by <i>Vetiveria</i> in ‘pot & pail’ system during the second trial.....	52
Table 4-3 Solution pH before and after the Third Trial	53
Table 4-4 The mean shoots height in the third trial (unit: cm; n=3)	55
Table 4-5 Effect of amendments on dry weight of <i>Vetiveria</i> (mean \pm SD, n=3) grown in ‘pot & pail’ at the end of the third trial	55
Table 4-6 Arsenic concentrations in the roots at the beginning and end of the third trial.....	56
Table 4-7 The arsenic concentration in the shoot dry matter after the third trial (unit: mg/kg)	57
Table 4-8 The variation for arsenic uptake efficiencies	58

Abbreviations

ADD	Average Daily Dose
As	Arsenic
BF	Bio-concentration Factor
CDTA	Leneditritilotetraacetic Acid
DTPA	Diethylenetriaminepentaacetic Acid
EC	Electrical Conductivity
EDTA	Ethylendiaminetriacetic Acid
EESI	Environmental Earth Science International
EGTA	Ethylene Glycol Tetraacetic Acid
EPA	Environmental Protection Agencies
FH	High concentration of Fulvic Acid 0.1%
FL	Low Level of Fulvic Acid 0.01%
FT	Frist Trial
GW	Groundwater
HEDTA	N-Hydroxyethyl-Ethylenediamine-Triacetic Acid
HI	Hazard Index
ICP-MS	Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry
Maize	<i>Zea mays</i>
NOM	Natural Organic Matters
NTA	Nitrilotriacetic Acid
OA	Oleic Acid
PAH's	Polycyclicaromatichydrocarbons
PCB's	Polychlorinatedbiphenyls
PCPs	Pentachlorophenols
RfD	Reference Dose
SF	The Slope Factor
SH	High concentration of Straw Water 0.1%
SL	Low Level of Straw Water 0.01%
SOM	Soil Organic Matter
ST	Second Trial
TF	Translocation Factor
TT	Third Trial
W	Tap Water
WHO	World Health Organization